

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM LYLE NIBLE,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JEFF MACOMBER, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01259-DJC-CSK (PS)

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS  
(ECF Nos. 100, 101)

Plaintiff William Lyle Nible, who is proceeding pro se, has filed two miscellaneous motions.<sup>1</sup> (ECF No. 10). Pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 230(g), the motions are submitted upon the record and the briefs.<sup>2</sup> For the reasons that follow, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's motions.

**I. MOTION TO CORRECT THE TRANSCRIPT**

On November 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion to correct the transcript for the Court's June 17, 2025 hearing pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60. (ECF No. 100.) Plaintiff seeks to correct the transcript at page 5, line 13. *Id.* at 2. The transcript records Plaintiff stating that "They are not allowed to use my prior 290 registration or

<sup>1</sup> This matter proceeds before the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, and Local Rule 302(c).

<sup>2</sup> The district court's Local Rules are accessible on the district court's website: <https://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/rules/local-rules/>.

1 current law and Missouri Revised Statute 566.1.7. That's, that's settled Missouri law."  
2 ECF No. 99 at 5. Plaintiff requests the Court amend the recorded reference from  
3 "566.1.7" to "566.147." ECF No. 100 at 2. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(a),  
4 "[t]he court may correct a clerical mistake or a mistake arising from oversight or omission  
5 whenever one is found in a judgment, order, or other part of the record." After reviewing  
6 the audio for the hearing, the Court confirms the clerical mistake and that the transcript  
7 record should be amended to "566.147." Accordingly, the Court grants Plaintiff's motion  
8 to correct the transcript and orders the official transcript for the June 17, 2025 hearing be  
9 corrected from "566.1.7" on page 5, line 13, to "566.147."

## 10 **II. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE LATE OBJECTIONS**

11 On November 3, 2025, Plaintiff also filed a motion for leave to file late objections  
12 to the Court's September 22, 2025 findings and recommendations denying Plaintiff's  
13 motion to proceed in forma pauperis. (ECF No. 101.) Plaintiff also simultaneously filed  
14 his objections to the Court's September 22, 2025 findings and recommendations for the  
15 Court's consideration. (ECF No. 102.) Plaintiff's objections were due October 6, 2025.  
16 See 9/22/2025 Findings and Recommendations (ECF No. 97). Despite Plaintiff's late  
17 filing, the Court will grant Plaintiff's motion and accept Plaintiff's objections filed at ECF  
18 No. 102.

## 19 **III. CONCLUSION**

20 It is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 21 1. Plaintiff's motion to correct the transcript (ECF No. 100) is GRANTED. The Court  
22 orders the June 15, 2025 hearing transcript be corrected on page 5, line 13 from  
23 "566.1.7" to "566.147"; and
- 24 2. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file late objections (ECF No. 102) is GRANTED.  
25 Plaintiff's objections to the September 22, 2025 findings and recommendations


26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 filed at ECF No. 102 are deemed accepted.

2  
3 Dated: November 26, 2025

4   
5 CHI SOO KIM  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6 4, nibl1259.24  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28